

RE: Business Opportunity Rule, R511993

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing this letter because I am concerned about the proposed Business Opportunity Rule R511993. I believe that in its presented form, it could prevent me from continuing as an independent distributor and destroy my small business.

I recently got involved as an independent distributor with Xango and have been very pleased. In May of 2005 I graduated from college with a business degree and was unable to find a job. I have always wanted to be in business for myself, however without adequate financial backing it is very difficult to get started. So when I discovered the opportunity that the network marketing system provided I knew I finally discovered the chance to have my own business.

Being an independent distributor is providing me with the opportunity to secure myself financially without a lot of debt. I know of no other way to accomplish this. Not only am I experiencing financial benefits, but I have also grown as a person. I am learning to be a more self-confident, polished speaker and person. I have discovered so much about myself through my experiences as an independent distributor. So please do not destroy my small business; we need it!

Some of the sections in the proposed rule would make it hard or almost impossible for me to sell my nutritional products. One of the most difficult sections of the proposed rule is the seven-day waiting period to enroll a new Xango distributor.

This waiting period will give the public the idea that there's something wrong with our plan and also reflects badly on me. I also think this seven-day waiting period is unnecessary, because Xango already has a 100% 30 day buyback policy for our product.

Xango sales kit only costs \$ 35. People buy TVs, cars, and other items that cost much more than that and they don't have to wait seven-days. Under this waiting period requirement, I will need to keep very detailed records when I first speak to a prospect and will then have to send in reports to my company. This is very impractical when speaking to someone in a grocery store or at Wal Mart. I am a small home business and this burden could destroy my business.

Finally, the proposed rule requires the disclosure of a minimum of 10 prior purchasers nearest to the prospective purchaser. I am glad to provide references, but in this day of identity theft, I am very uncomfortable giving out the personal information of individuals (without their approval) to strangers.

Women in my organization may be subject to sexual or racial harassment so this part cannot go in at all, unless the FTC passes an addition to this rule prohibiting sexual or racial attacks related to this disclosure. In the end, the rule will bind the FTC to take direct enforcement action on sexual and racial attacks

with a special unit assigned to monitor actions related to the disclosure forms. This will in turn require more staff and paper work for the FTC. Not only this, but this requirement would not deter scam artist who will simple provide fraudulent references.

Lastly, the litigation reporting process does not distinguish between Civil and Criminal cases to general public. Also it is unfair in that it does not distinguish between winning and losing lawsuits. This could cast an unjustified negative light on my business.

I have seen many scams on the Internet and have been approached by many crooks because of my success. This rule will do nothing to stop them. They hurt my business! This rule will not stop crooks – they violate the current rule all the time and will find a way to violate new laws. But I am a good American citizen and it will hurt me even more.

The FTC goals are noble, but there are millions of good prospects in the U.S. Instead, how about more enforcement of laws on the books to stop crooks from stealing from good hardworking MLM distributors?

Thank you and please help me.

Sincerely,

Casandra Short